

America's

FUTURE

A Weekly Review of News, Books and Public Affairs

Volume 3

March 10, 1981

Number 10

Britain and Red China	1
Operation Abolition	2
How Dokey?	4
Forthright Admiral. . . Book Review	5
Governmentitis	6
Stimulating the Economy	7

BRITAIN AND RED CHINA

Last week we reported on the stepped-up drive to get the communist regime in China into the United Nations. Many people cannot understand why Great Britain joins the softies-on-communism in America in trying to bring into the UN the Chinese Red slave-masters.

The case of Great Britain points up a tremendous difference between British and American methods of conducting foreign policy. Britain makes alliances strictly on the basis of what she thinks is best for Great Britain.

American alliances are not made primarily in the interest of the United States but in the interest of so-called allies. Actually, Britain operates to this day on Lord Palmerston's famous dictum of the last century - that Great Britain has neither friends nor enemies, only interests.

England, as an island nation, must live on world trade. She does not care with whom she trades so long as she can trade. She recognized the Red regime in China almost immediately after it seized

power. She was supposed to be our ally during the Korean War, but that did not stop her from trading with the enemy we were fighting in that war. As a matter of fact, Britain has always made it a practice to recognize any regime which at the moment holds power in any country. That was all right in the old days, but modern English leaders have been so infected with the socialist virus that they do not understand the nature of the communist menace. When they insist on recognizing Red regimes, they fail to realize that they are supporting a conspiracy which is the sworn enemy of everything worth saving in Britain's democratic heritage.

However, no matter how wrong-headed her policy may be, all this is Britain's business. The big mistake that America makes is to per-

mit *her* policy to be influenced by an ally who, basically, looks upon us as neither friend nor enemy but only as a means of furthering her own interests.

Incidentally, it was refreshing to hear President Garcia of the Philippines, whose nation is practically at Red China's front door, declare that his country would not approve recognition or admission to the UN of Red China. He says the Filipinos do not want 'an influx of hordes of spies, propagandists and saboteurs working from the protection of a diplomatic sanctuary in our midst.' This courageous stand brings to mind the latest British spy trial. According to Senator Clinton Anderson, it is suspected that our atomic-submarine secret, which we shared with England, may have been delivered to Russia.

OPERATION ABOLITION

The communists in the United States are in a first-class tizzy. And they have managed as usual to embroil all the pro-communists, dupes and fuzzy-minded 'liberals' in the same tizzy. The cause of the tizzy? The Reds' old enemy, the House Un-American

Activities Committee. Of course, there is nothing new about the efforts of the Reds and their dupes to destroy this Committee. They have been at it for years. But now they are up against something which has really thrown them into a rage - a factual film,

America's

FUTURE

Published every week by America's Future, Inc., 542 Main Street, New Rochelle, New York. A non-profit, educational organization.

R. K. Scott Publisher
 Rosalie M. Gordon Editor
 John T. Flynn . . . Editorial Consultant
 John C. Wetzel . . . Business Manager

Subscription Price: \$5 per year, \$12 for three years. Ten week trial subscription \$1. Additional copies of specific issues: 1 copy for 15¢; 10 copies for \$1; 50 for \$4; 100 for \$6; 1,000 for \$30 - each price for bulk mailing to one person.

Second class mail privileges authorized at New Rochelle, New York.

a motion picture which shows them up for what they are. This is a tough nut to crack but, according to pattern, the Reds manage to line up well-meaning dupes (maybe the word should be dopes) to do their dirty work.

First, about the film, for those who may not have seen or heard of it. It is not a Hollywood production - perish the thought! It is a short, 45-minute picture. It is called *Operation Abolition*. It was not written, acted and produced in a movie studio. There is nothing fictional about it. The scenes it depicts were photographed on the spot in San Francisco last May. The Un-American

Activities Committee was holding hearings into communist subversion in that area. The communists organized and led a student riot against the Committee. It was a real riot - the kind the communists cook up all around the world - in which police were kicked and spat upon and which finally had to be dispersed with fire hoses. Fortunately, the news cameras were grinding away all the time and it was from these films that *Operation Abolition* was made.

The movie was made available to any interested citizen or group who wanted to buy or rent it. It can be shown on a 16mm. sound projector. Its success must be the envy of Hollywood. Clubs, organizations, church groups, even small groups of individuals have been showing it to packed and horrified audiences all over the country. The Reds and their dupes immediately went to work to try to discredit the film. They tried to smear it by saying it was 'distorted' and 'slanted' - strange charges coming from the masters of distortion and slanting. But every charge was thoroughly disproved and the film continues to be a vivid and factual record of how the Reds can corral a mob

of innocent students against an authorized committee of the United States Congress.

But guess who now comes to the rescue of the communists in trying to discredit this film? None other than the National Council of Churches. The film has been and is being shown by many churches and church groups whose members are evidently much more aware of the threat to religion by communism than is the National Council. The Council passed a resolution -

it seems constantly to be passing resolutions with an odd leftist tinge. This one warned churches not to show the film without having somebody around to supply what are called 'supplementary facts' about its subject and compilation. This can only mean, whether the National Council of Churches realizes it or not, that it is suggesting that if church groups show the film, they have somebody present to parrot the communist smears against the film.

HOW DOPEY?

While we are on this subject of the House Un-American Activities Committee, you may not have noticed - it was well-buried or sketchily reported in many newspapers - that a group of 139 college administrators and teachers from 17 schools issued a strong defense of the Committee not long ago. This is indeed an encouraging sign - that patriotic, loyal and numerous college faculty members are finally speaking out against the loud minority who, as this statement said, 'give aid and comfort to the enemies of our country by attacking, in the name of the academic profession, the in-

vestigative committees of Congress that alone have the power to expose subversion and treason.' Even so, the chairman said there would have been many more signatures had not many faculty members been afraid to sign for fear of jeopardizing their college careers or losing their jobs.

This is a pretty terrible situation, especially when we note that a week after this fine statement was issued, the same old gang of academic, ministerial and other dupes (including of course Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt) were in again with another blast at the Un-American Activities Committee. This one was in

the form of a page-and-a-half advertisement in the New York Times and the Washington Post - and ads like that cost a lot of money.

National Review reported that a student noticed the name of his university chaplain in this weird company of so-called 'brains' who want to destroy the House Committee. He went to the chaplain and asked him: how come? It turned out that the university chaplain knew nothing what-

ever about the House Committee on Un-American Activities - how it conducted its investigations, what it had revealed or the great services it had performed. But the chaplain was 'agin' it anyway, because of two cases he mentioned. But the House Committee had nothing to do with these two cases - they had been handled by another committee of the Congress. To which the natural query is: How dupey - or dopey - can you get?

Foregoing items covered in Mutual network broadcast 3/5/61

Book Review FORTHRIGHT ADMIRAL

THE ADMIRAL'S LOG II: In Search of Freedom, by Ben Moreell, 205 pages, Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, Phila., \$1.00.

Two years ago the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists bound a batch of Admiral Moreell's major addresses into a book entitled *The Admiral's Log*. Now the ISI has put 15 more of his speeches and articles into a paperback volume.

Admiral Moreell is forthright: 'I believe that no one, no matter how exalted his position, can determine for

172 million people their day-to-day economic and social decisions concerning such matters as wages, prices, production, associations...I propose that these decisions...be returned to the persons concerned.' To achieve this, he proposes five steps:

1. The ending of all further raids on the public treasury - whether conducted by unions, businessmen, farmers or any other group.
2. An orderly demobilization of the bureaucracy as the road back to social health and sanity.
3. The return of governmental

power to the states wherever possible. 4. Resistance to the government panderer who comes to us offering gifts paid for with our own money, in return for a surrender of our natural rights. 5. The acknowledgement of individual moral responsibility.

It is quite obvious that Ben Moreell not only knows where freedom is to be found, but where it continues to be lost. He knows the 'what' of freedom, too. But does he know the 'why' - other than that there is a measure of ephemeral joy in doing precisely as one pleases? Can he tell Caesar why men ought to be free rather than the totally organized agents of an anthill state? Yes, he can, in the moral terms of a deeply religious man.

'Since all men are creatures of God,' Moreell writes, 'each of us derives his individuality and his freedom from God. Thus, each person

is sovereign in his relations with all other persons. It follows that no man can arrogate to himself the authority to trespass on God-given rights of others without violating the moral law, nor can any group, or even government, vest itself with such authority.'

The trouble, of course, is that Caesar believes in no god but himself, a fateful delusion which has kept the tree of liberty well watered with blood in this century. The alternative to more spillage lies partly in winning converts away from what they imagine is a safe non-commitment. Such illusory safety, Dante warned, is a ticket to 'the hottest places in Hell.' This new pocket-size collection of Admiral Moreell's addresses and essays will help toward their conversion.

- John G. Ackelmire in
NATIONAL REVIEW

GOVERNMENTITIS

"Have you ever had any of these symptoms? Have you ever said, for instance:

"There should be government scholarships to all colleges?

"Medical insurance should be part of Social Security?

"We should have a new recreation center in our town?

"Then have you also said in almost the same breath: Our taxes are too high. We need a cut in both state and federal

income taxes. How else can we have the money we need to live! Especially today - with inflation...

"It's entirely possible you aren't even aware that you have the symptoms of the 'gimmes,' otherwise known as pass-the-buck-to-governmentitis.

"'Gimmes' is an all-encompassing malady that has affected the thinking of many honest men and women.

"Many victims of the 'gimmes' are hard-working people - not the kind who expect something for nothing. They are sincere law-abiding citizens.

"Occasional symptoms don't always mean that you have this contagious disease. But watch out. It's easy to catch. And don't forget that every time you want something from your government, it's you - and your fellow taxpayers - who, in the end, must pay the costs of every government program."

- Tampa (Fla.) GENERAL NEWS

STIMULATING THE ECONOMY

"...Given relief from excessive taxation, the individual citizen would stimulate the economy considerably by his own purchases, do it more efficiently than massive government, and be decidedly happier than if government were doing it for him. I am a case in point.

"I own a five-year-old car and rent a house that lacks several appliances. If federal and state governments would allow me to keep a few more dollars I earn, rather than

AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC., 542 Main St., New Rochelle, N.Y.

I understand you fill orders for books at regular list price, postage paid. Please mail me _____ copies of the book noted below. My check for \$_____ is enclosed ☐ Please bill me ☐.

Book I want is _____

NAME _____

Address _____ Date _____

spending it for my questionable and dubious welfare, I could certainly do a little economy-stimulating on my own. Housing starts and new car sales would each increase by one, not to mention appliance sales volume. There must be several million others who would do the same.

"This type of program has one obvious drawback. Who would pay the Harvard professors?" - John V. Warso in a letter to
the Wall Street JOURNAL

AMERICA'S FUTURE, INC.
542 Main St. New Rochelle N Y

